

	Middle Years Programme	Form F3.1
	Moderation coversheet: Subjects	

Please complete a copy of this form for **each** folder of work submitted for moderation.

Please ensure that the material being submitted for moderation conforms to the requirements set out in the relevant subject group guide. All the criteria **must be applied twice** within the folder accompanying this form, unless stated otherwise in the subject guide.

School name: Victoria Shanghai Academy School code: _____

Student's name/number: Sharon LAU Subject: Maths (Extended)

The student's work is (please mark box):

☐ comparatively good
 ☒ average
 ☐ comparatively weak

Nature and title of assessment task		Criteria					
		A	B	C	D	E	F
1. Bench Design (Investigation)	Teacher	3			2		
	Moderator						
2. Patterns in Probability (timed assessment task)	Teacher		2	2			
	Moderator						
3. A Special Matrix (timed assessment task)	Teacher		3		3		
	Moderator						
4. Broad-Based Test	Teacher	5		5			
	Moderator						

Please use the reverse of this form or separate sheets to identify the conditions under which each piece of work was done (project, classroom test, end-of-term examination, and so on), the amount of support provided, any special circumstances, and general/specific information on the student. Provide any information that may assist the moderators in determining how the criteria were applied.

Name of teacher: F J Davis

Signature of teacher: _____ Date: 26th March 2012

Names of teachers involved in internal standardization for this subject:

Frank Davis, Daniel Slosberg, Echo Li

Teacher's comments:

Task & Criterion	Grade	General Remarks	Why this grade
Bench A	3	A basic profile of a bench was arrived at, using appropriately non-linear equations.	The student came up with two sophisticated equations (a cubic and a log) that formed the basic profile of her bench. There was a reasonable attempt to link the scale used for the graph with basic information she had researched regarding heights and lengths that would make the bench comfortable. There was no explicit description of where the equations had come from (though technology was probably the source), so we felt that a 3 for criterion A was appropriate.
Bench D	2	Sharon managed to do some internet-based research, and tried to relate this (basically heights of people) to the design specifications.	Her degree of accuracy was not commented on, and only very basic "real-world" research had been carried out, so we thought a 2 was the appropriate criterion D grade.
Prob B	2	This was a weak performance. Many of the WIN/LOSS "possibilities" didn't actually agree with the reality of the task, and she made the wrong assumption right at the beginning that $a=b$ despite instructions to the contrary.	We felt there was a genuine attempt to order her "results" into a form that would reveal patterns and there was an attempt from the student to match up her probabilities with predictable powers of 2 in the denominator of her fractions. Q5 is an example of this (though, of course, her answer is incorrect). We felt that a 2 was the maximum grade we could award in criterion B
Prob C	2	It wasn't particularly easy to follow Sharon's logic, and there was very little narrative offered.	In questions 3 and 4, she tried (with partial success) to use probability notation and match it up to Win/Lose sequences. We felt this merited no more than a level 2 here.

Task & Criterion	Grade	General Remarks	Why this grade
Matrix B	3	One or two unfortunate errors led to wrong conclusions.	She was generally successful with the particular matrix calculations (in Part 1 (a), (b), (c), (g), (h), (i), (k), (l) and (m)) and in part (d) was almost successful in generalising. Her attempt to engage with general calculations (i.e. with letters rather than numbers) merited a level 3.
Matrix D	3	We felt that, in the criterion D part of the task, she generally had a reasonable feel for what she was doing but poor communication, possibly, let her down.	In Part 2(b), she appreciated that a geometrical transformation had taken place, but wasn't able to describe it very well. A similar thing happened with the inverse of the matrix – she struggled to calculate it, but she had the right idea of what it meant in the context of the transformation. In Part 2(g) she showed implicit understanding that multiple transformations can leave an object unchanged.
Test A	5	There were, unfortunately, quite a few errors in the earlier questions. We were impressed, though with her performance with the more challenging questions	The first 3 questions had a couple of small errors. She did poorly on Q4. Q5 was weak (though some follow-through was awarded in (a)(ii)). She did a pretty good job with questions 6 and 9, and a fair attempt at Q8, and even a decent start at Q11.
Test C	5	It was reasonably easy to see where she was constructing her answers, and there were very few “missing steps” in her solutions.	She showed good use of notation with factorising, indices, quadratics and vectors. She stumbled a little with notation for probability and she missed an opportunity to show she could handle inverses of matrices. Thus we felt a level 5 to be appropriate.